Projective measurement onto arbitrary superposition of coherent state bases.

Shuro Izumi,[1,2] Masahiro Takeoka,[1] Kentaro Wakui,[1] Mikio Fujiwara,[1] Kazuhiro Ema,[2] and Masahide Sasaki[1]

[1] *National Institute of Information and Communications Technology, 4-2-1 Nukui-kita, Koganei, Tokyo 184-8795, Japan*
[2] *Sophia University, 7-1 Kioicho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-8554, Japan*

(Dated: February 22, 2017)

One of the peculiar features in quantum mechanics is that a superposition of macroscopically distinct states can exits. In optical system, this is highlighted by a superposition of coherent states (SCS), i.e. a superposition of classical states. Recently this highly nontrivial quantum state and its variant have been demonstrated experimentally. Here we demonstrate the superposition of coherent states in *quantum measurement* which is also a key concept in quantum mechanics. More precisely, we propose and implement a projection measurement onto the arbitrary superposition of the SCS bases in optical system. The measurement operators are reconstructed experimentally by a novel quantum detector tomography protocol. Our device is realized by combining the displacement operation and photon counting, well established technologies, and thus has implications in various optical quantum information processing applications.

PACS numbers:

arXiv:1702.06242v1 [quant-ph] 21 Feb 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum measurement plays an essential role in Quantum Information Processing (QIP). In quantum optical system, the standard measurements are homodyne detector and photon detector that measure the physical observables of light: quadrature amplitudes and photon numbers, respectively.

In principle, however, the quantum measurement is not necessarily restricted to the physical observables. In other words, it is possible to construct a measurement that is no longer related to simple physical observables. The example particularly considered here is the projection measurement onto the superposition of coherent states (SCS), $a_0|\alpha\rangle + a_1|-\alpha\rangle$, where $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ are the coherent state, i.e. classical state, with amplitude $\pm\alpha$. More precisely, we consider the artibrary projection measurement in the space spanned by the SCS bases $|C_\pm\rangle = (|\alpha\rangle \pm |-\alpha\rangle)/\mathcal{N}_\pm$ ($\mathcal{N}_\pm$ are the normalization factors):

$$\begin{cases} |\pi_0^{SCS}\rangle = c_0|C_+\rangle + c_1 e^{i\phi}|C_-\rangle, \\ |\pi_1^{SCS}\rangle = c_1 e^{-i\phi}|C_+\rangle - c_0|C_-\rangle, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where c_0 and c_1 are real and satisfy $c_0^2 + c_1^2 = 1$ and ϕ denotes the relative phase between $|C_\pm\rangle$.

The SCS state is known as a typical example of macroscopic quantum superposition (and thus sometimes regarded as "Schrödinger cat state") showing highly nonclassical properties. Generation of such optical states have been experimentally accomplished by several groups [1–9] for relatively small α. Especially in Ref.[6], generation of the approximate SCS with arbitrarily controlled $\{c_0, c_1, \phi\}$ is demonstrated. In contrast, however, a few attempts have been made for the exploration of the measurement described by the SCS bases. Only when $\{c_0 = 1, c_1 = 0, \phi = 0\}$ (i.e. projection onto $\{|C_\pm\rangle\}$), it is implementable by the parity measurement of photon numbers. However, the implementation of the measurement for general $\{c_0, c_1, \phi\}$ remains as a challenge.

In this paper, we propose and experimentally demonstrate physical implementation of the SCS measurement with arbitrary $\{c_0, c_1, \phi\}$ in the regime of small α. The structure of the implemented measurement (i.e. its positive operator valued measure (POVM)) is reconstructed by the quantum detector tomography (QDT) [10–16] and we evaluate the fidelity between the experimentally reconstructed POVM of our measurement device and the ideal SCS measurement in Eq. (1). We experimentally demonstrate the fidelities that cannot be achieved by conventional measurements such as homodyne detector or photon number resolving detector (PNRD).

Our scheme is inspired by the so-called quantum receiver idea in optical communication where the purpose of the receiver is to discriminate coherent states with minimum error probabilities [19]. The implementation of such receiver has been extensively explored in theory [20–27] and experiment [28–35]. In this scenario, it is known that the optimal quantum measurement for discriminating the binary phase shift keyed (BPSK) coherent states $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ is given by Eq. (1) with specific sets of $\{c_0, c_1\}$ and $\phi = 0$ (i.e. real superposition). Here we generalize such measurement by including arbitrary complex superposition ($\phi \neq 0$) and also by directly evaluating the structure of its POVM via QDT.

It is worth to mention the related work in [16] where they performed a full detection tomography of a hybrid measurement of homodyne and PNRD in continuous variable Hilbert space and was able to reveal the wave-particle duality in measurement process. In our work, on the other hand, the purpose is to implement specific but nontrivial POVMs described by superposition of coherent states (Eq. (1)). Therefore our detection tomography also concentrates on the Hilbert space spanned by the projectors in Eq. (1). For this purpose, we develop a modified QDT technique that is of independent interest. Our result has direct implications in applications using SCS states and their measurements such as quantum computation with optical coherent states [17, 18] or

optimal detection of coherent states in optical communication [19–35].

II. SCS MEASUREMENT

A schematic of our measurement is shown in Fig. 1 (a). It consists of a PNRD preceded by a displacement operation, which we call the displaced-photon counting hereafter. The measurement operators of our schematic in Fig. 1 (a) are given by,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Pi}_0^{\rm DP} &= \sum_{\omega_0} \hat{D}(\beta)|n\rangle\langle n|\hat{D}(\beta)^\dagger \\ &\quad \{\omega_0| \quad |\langle\pi_0^{SCS}|\hat{D}(\beta)|n\rangle|^2 \geq |\langle\pi_1^{SCS}|\hat{D}(\beta)|n\rangle|^2\}, \\ \hat{\Pi}_1^{\rm DP} &= \hat{I} - \hat{\Pi}_0^{\rm DP}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the displacement operation $\hat{D}(\beta) = \exp[(\beta\hat{a}^\dagger - \beta^*\hat{a})]$ allows us to flexibly modulate the amplitude and phase of the coherent state $|\gamma\rangle$ such that $\hat{D}(\beta)|\gamma\rangle \sim |\gamma+\beta\rangle$. The displacement operation is physically implemented by combining the signal state with a local oscillator (LO) at a beam splitter with nearly unit transmittance. A measurement operator of the PNRD is given by a set of photon number bases $\{\hat{\Pi}_n = |n\rangle\langle n|\}$.

The idea of our quasi-SCS measurement is intuitively explained as follows. If the coherent amplitude is small, the SCS bases defined in the Eq. (1) can also be simply tailored in a superposition of a vacuum and single photon bases,

$$\begin{aligned}|\pi_0^{SCS}\rangle &= c_0|C_+\rangle + c_1 e^{i\phi}|C_-\rangle \\ &\propto (c_0/\mathcal{N}_+)|0\rangle + (c_1 e^{i\phi}/\mathcal{N}_-)\alpha|1\rangle + \cdots . \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Similarly the POVM in Eq. (2) is approximated by $\hat{\Pi}_0^{\rm DP} = \hat{D}(\beta)|0\rangle\langle 0|\hat{D}(\beta)$ and its complement for $\hat{\Pi}_1^{\rm DP}$. Then we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{D}(\beta)|0\rangle &= |\beta\rangle \\ &\propto |0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle + \cdots . \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The coefficient of the single photon basis in the above equation can be freely controlled by adjusting the amplitude and phase of the displacement operation. Thus the combination of the displacement operation and the photon counting provides high fidelity with the SCS measurement in small coherent amplitude region. The amplitude and phase of the displacement operation are numerically optimized so as to maximize the fidelity between the SCS measurement and the displaced-photon counting measurement that is defined as,

$$\mathcal{F}^{\rm DP} = (\langle\pi_0^{SCS}|\hat{\Pi}_0^{\rm DP}|\pi_0^{SCS}\rangle + \langle\pi_1^{SCS}|\hat{\Pi}_1^{\rm DP}|\pi_1^{SCS}\rangle)/2. \quad (5)$$

To evaluate the performance of our measurement strategy compared with the conventional measurements, we calculate the fidelities of the SCS measurement with the homodyne measurement and the PNRD without displacement. We define the POVM of the homodyne measurement with binary outcomes as $\{\hat{\Pi}_0^{\rm HD} = \int_{x_{\rm th}}^{\infty}|x_\phi\rangle\langle x_\phi|\,dx_\phi, \hat{\Pi}_1^{\rm HD} = \hat{I} - \hat{\Pi}_0^{\rm HD}\}$, where $\{|x_\phi\rangle\}$ is the quadrature basis and ϕ is adjustable by changing the optical phase of the local oscillator. We determine the threshold value $x_{\rm th}$ such that the fidelity

$$\mathcal{F}^{\rm HD} = (\langle\pi_0^{SCS}|\hat{\Pi}_0^{\rm HD}|\pi_0^{SCS}\rangle + \langle\pi_1^{SCS}|\hat{\Pi}_1^{\rm HD}|\pi_1^{SCS}\rangle)/2, \quad (6)$$

is maximized. The PNRD is given by setting $\beta = 0$ in Eq. (2). The fidelity to the SCS is then given by a simple form,

$$\mathcal{F}^{\rm PN} = \begin{cases} c_0^2 & (0.5 \leq c_0^2 \leq 1) \\ c_1^2 & (0 \leq c_0^2 < 0.5) \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

We compare the fidelities for the three-type of measurements in Fig. 1 (b). The relative phase and the coherent amplitude of the target SCS measurement are set to $\phi = 0$ and $\alpha = 0.707$ respectively. The displaced-photon counting shows high fidelity for a whole range of c_0. Figure 1 (c) depicts the optimal displacement amplitude as a function of the superposition coefficient c_0^2. The optimal amplitude of displacement is decreased with the increase of the target coefficient and reaches to zero at $c_0^2 = 1$ where the SCS measurement can be achieved by the parity measurement using the PNRD. Also, as will be shown later, our scheme can approximate the SCS measurement with a complex phase factor ($\phi \neq 0$) by optmizing the phase of the displacement.



FIG. 1: (a) Simple schematic of our measurement scheme. $\hat{\rho}^{|C_\pm\rangle}$ indicates the state that can be described in the two-dimensional space $|C_\pm\rangle$. (b) Fidelity as a function of the superposition coefficient c_0^2 with fixed mean photon number $\alpha = 0.707$ and phase $\phi = 0$. Dot-line, solid-line and dash-line denote the displaced-photon counting, the homodyne measurement and the PNRD respectively. (c) Corresponding optimal displacement amplitude as a function of the superposition coefficient c_0^2.

III. EXPERIMENT

Our experimental setup is depicted in Fig. 2. We prepare a sequence of optical pulses at a telecom wave-



FIG. 2: Experimental setup. AOM : acousto-optic modulator, BS : beam splitter, PZT : piezo transducer, SNSPD : superconducting nanowire single photon detector. The measurement process framed by red dashed line corresponds to the SCS measurement.

length 1549nm with repetition rate 900kHz and pulse width 100nm by modulating continuous wave laser using an acousto-optic modulator (AOM). The optical pulse is first divided into two parts where one is the local oscillator for the displacement and the other is the probe pulse for the measurement characterization. For each state, we adjust the optical amplitude independently by means of a set of a half wave plate and a polarizer. The probe state is interfered with the LO light on an asymmetric fiber coupler with transmittance $\tau = 0.99$, which leads to the physical implementation of the displacement operation, and detected by the photon counter. We achieve the visibility $= 0.998$ for the displacement operation. In the experiment, instead of the PNRD, we use a superconducting nanowire single photon detector (SNSPD) which is capable of discriminating if the photon exists (on) or not (off) [38, 39].

The degradation of the fidelity due to the lack of the photon number resolution is negligible when the coherent amplitude α is small enough such that the probability of having more than one photon is negligible. Detection efficiency and dark count noise of the SNSPD are experimentally measured to be 68.9% and 5.32×10^{-5} counts per pulse respectively. The optical relative phase between the probe state and the local oscillator for the displacement operation, which determines the phase ϕ of the SCS measurement, is controlled by a piezo transducer (PZT). We acquire 2×10^5 experimental data for each probe state.

The implemented POVM is experimentally characterized by quantum detector tomography. Characterization over the entire phase space is in principle possible by sweeping the quadrature amplitudes of coherent state [10, 16]. Technically, one should use a large number of probes with different quadrature amplitudes. However, this is redundant in our case since we focus on the two-dimensional space spanned by $|C_\pm\rangle$. For a two-dimensional space, it is known that four different probes are enough for the tomography [40], for example in our case, $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ and $(|\alpha\rangle \pm i\,|-\alpha\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. The coherent states $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ are easy to prepare. In contrast, to prepare well-calibrated SCSs as the probe is still challenging with the current technology. Thus we develop a method which replaces the SCS probes by $2k$-set of coherent states $\{|\pm i\gamma_k\rangle\}$ with various amplitudes. Details of the method is discussed in the Appendix. By numerically simulating the proposed QDT method, we find that the four probe states $\{|\pm i\gamma_1\rangle, |\pm i\gamma_2\rangle\}$ and the coherent probes $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ suffice to characterize our measurement. The set of the probe states $\{|\pm\alpha\rangle, |\pm i\gamma_1\rangle, |\pm i\gamma_2\rangle\}$ and their measurement outcomes enable us to reconstruct the POVM and we adopt the maximally likelihood procedure for the reconstruction [37].



FIG. 3: (a) Real and (b) imaginary part of the reconstructed POVM. The displacement amplitude is set to $\beta = 0.894$ and the phase of the displacement with respect to the probe state $|\alpha\rangle$ is fixed to $\pi/2$.

An example of the experimentally reconstructed POVM is depicted in Fig. 3. The amplitude and the phase of the target SCS bases are $\alpha = 0.50$ and $\phi = \pi/2$ respectively. As a corresponding measurement, we prepare the local oscillator for the displacement operation with the amplitude $\beta = 0.894$ and the relative phase $\pi/2$ with respect to $|\alpha\rangle$. Figure 4 plots the fidelities between the target SCS measurement and the experimentally reconstructed dispaced-photon counting for various c_0^2 (red circles). The blue circles are the same plots after com-

pensating the loss. These plots are compared with their theoretical curves (solid lines) and the theoretical curves for the ideal homodyne (dashed line) and PNRD (long-dashed line) measurements.

In Fig. 4, The target SCS amplitude and the relative phase are $\alpha = 0.50$ and, (a) $\phi = 0$ and (b) $\phi = \pi/2$, respectively. Experimental results indicate that we can realize the SCS measurements with the fidelity better than both the ideal homodyne measurement and the ideal PNRD in the specific c_0^2 range. Furthermore, by compensating the loss due to non-unit detection efficiency, our experimental results outperform the ideal homodyne and the ideal PNRD in a whole range of c_0^2 except $c_0^2 \sim 1$ where the photon number resolving capability is required. As shown in Fig. 1(c), the optimal amplitude of the displacement operation varies depending on the coefficient of the target SCS measurement. We use 9 different displacement amplitudes shown in Fig. 4(c) to acquire the experimental data for Fig. 4(a). The effect of this stepwise displacement modulation appears in the discontinuity of the fidelity plots in Fig. 4(a).

A discrepancy between the theoretical prediction and the experimentally obtained fidelity can be explained as follows. Black solid thick and thin lines in Fig. 4 represent the theoretical fidelity between the displaced-photon counting and the SCS measurement with the coherent amplitude $\alpha = 0.50$, where $\alpha = 0.50$ is determined by averaging the probe amplitude used to characterize each displacement condition. The probe amplitude cannot be calibrated to the exactly same value due to the technical reasons and the systematic error of the probe amplitude is estimated to $\alpha = 0.50 \pm 0.01$. In addition, the phase of the probe states with respect to the LO cannot be perfectly set to the desired value. Both the finite precision of the amplitude and the phase make the experimental results higher or lower than the theoretical values.



FIG. 4: Fidelity as a function of the superposition coefficient c_0^2 with the coherent amplitude $\alpha = 0.50$ and the relative phase, (a) $\phi = 0$ and (b) $\phi = \pi/2$. The displaced photon counting in the ideal case (black solid thick line), the homodyne measurement (black dashed line), the PNRD (black solid line), the displaced photon counting in the experimental condition for theory (black solid thin line) and experiment (red point), the experimental results with loss compensation (blue point) are shown. (c) Experimentally prepared amplitude of the displacement operation for the result (a).

Figure 5 depicts a quadrant of a sphere with radius 1 in which experimentally obtained fidelities for various ϕ and c_0 are plotted. The distance from the sphere origin to the plotted point corresponds to the fidelity between the target SCS and experimentally realized POVM. Rotations in horizontal and vertical plane are equivalent to variation of ϕ and c_0 respectively.



FIG. 5: Experimentally obtained fidelities between the ideal SCS measurements and the displacement operation with the on-off counter. We set the amplitude of the SCS and the phase to $\alpha = 0.50$ and $\phi = 0$, 0.393, 0.787, 1.18, $\pi/2$ from back to front.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose and experimentally demonstrated the physical implementation of the projection measurement onto the SCS bases. Our theoretical analysis showed that the measurement process consisting of the displacement operation with the photon counter enables us to perform the SCS measurement with arbitrary $\{c_0, c_1, \phi\}$ in weak coherent amplitude case. We demonstrated the proof-of-principle experiment for the SCS projection measurement and characterized our measurement by the QDT approach. Although the fidelity between the ideal SCS measurement and the experimentally realized measurement was highly degraded because of the detector's imperfections, our experimental result showed higher fidelity than the ideal homodyne measurement and the ideal PNRD for specific range of c_0. Furthermore, by optimizing the amplitude and the phase of the displacement operation, we experimentally realized the SCS measurement with arbitrary $\{c_0, c_1, \phi\}$.

An interesting future direction is the physical realization of the projection measurement onto the SCS bases with arbitrary $\{c_0, c_1, \phi, \alpha\}$. In fact it was shown

that arbitrary two-dimensional projection measurement is achievable by introducing feedback operation to the displaced-photon counting measurement [23, 24]. The measurement strategy, which is often referred to as Dolinar receiver, was first proposed for the BPSK discrimination [21] and generalized for arbitrary two orthogonal optical states discrimination problem [23]. Thus the displaced-photon counting with the feedback operation allows us to perform perfect SCS measurement with large coherent amplitude. Another possible future work is the implementation of the SCS measurement for general input states. Our analysis is concentrated on the two-dimensional space spanned by the SCS bases. However, in principle, it is also possible to realize the SCS measurement in higher dimensional space. Such measurement procedure has not been explored but could be important tool for the optical QIP and communication scenarios.

Appendix A: Tomographic reconstruction of the displaced-photon counting in the SCS bases.

The POVM of the displaced-photon counting is reconstructed by probing with coherent states and applying the QDT method. In general, the QDT requires a large amount of probe states to cover a whole Hilbert space of interest. In our case, though $|C_\pm\rangle$ is a continuous variable optical state, the signal space we are interested in is restricted to the two-dimensional space spanned by $\{|C_+\rangle, |C_-\rangle\}$. Generally, the POVM tomography in a two-dimensional space requires at least four linearly independent probe states in the space [40]. In our case, while the real part of the POVM is easily probed via two coherent states $|\pm\alpha\rangle$, it is necessary to use a superposition of $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ with imaginary phase to probe the imaginary part of the POVM. An example of such a state is

$$|\phi^+_{\rm Im}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|\alpha\rangle + i|-\alpha\rangle\right), \tag{A1}$$

which is not available in the laboratory with enough quality at present. Instead, we develop a method with the use of extra coherent states with imaginary valued amplitudes $|i\gamma_k\rangle$ to obtain the probing statistics for $|\phi^+_{\rm Im}\rangle$.

In the following, we describe the method to reconstruct $\langle\phi^+_{\rm Im}|\hat{\Pi}_j|\phi^+_{\rm Im}\rangle$ without the SCS states. $\{\hat{\Pi}_j\}_j$ is the POVM to be reconstructed and its representation in the photon number basis is

$$\hat{\Pi}_j \equiv \sum_{m,n}\theta^{(j)}_{mn}|m\rangle\langle n|. \tag{A2}$$

If the probe $|\phi^+_{\rm Im}\rangle$ is available, its expectation value is given as

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\phi^+_{\rm Im}|\hat{\Pi}_j|\phi^+_{\rm Im}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}\Big\{\langle\alpha|\hat{\Pi}_j|\alpha\rangle + \langle-\alpha|\hat{\Pi}_j|-\alpha\rangle \\ &\quad + i\left(\langle\alpha|\hat{\Pi}_j|-\alpha\rangle - \langle-\alpha|\hat{\Pi}_j|\alpha\rangle\right)\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

The first two terms can be obtained by using the probe states $|\pm\alpha\rangle$. The last two terms are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}&i\left(\langle\alpha|\hat{\Pi}_j|-\alpha\rangle - \langle-\alpha|\hat{\Pi}_j|\alpha\rangle\right)\\ &= -ie^{-|\alpha|^2}\sum_{m,n}\frac{\alpha^{m+n}}{\sqrt{m!n!}}\left\{(-1)^m - (-1)^n\right\}\theta^{(j)}_{mn},\\ &= e^{-|\alpha|^2}\Big\{2\alpha\Theta^{(j)}_{01} + 2\alpha^3(\Theta^{(j)}_{03} - \Theta^{(j)}_{12})\\ &\quad + 2\alpha^5(\Theta^{(j)}_{05} - \Theta^{(j)}_{14} + \Theta^{(j)}_{23}) + \cdots\Big\}\\ &= 2e^{-|\alpha|^2}\left(\alpha\Phi^{(j)}_1 + \alpha^3\Phi^{(j)}_3 + \alpha^5\Phi^{(j)}_5 + \cdots\right),\end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

where $i\Theta^{(j)}_{mn} \equiv (\theta^{(j)}_{mn} - \theta^{(j)}_{nm})/\sqrt{m!n!}$ and $\Phi_1 = \Theta_{01}$, $\Phi_3 = \Theta_{03} - \Theta_{12}$, $\Phi_5 = \Theta_{05} - \Theta_{14} + \Theta_{23}$, etc. Note that Φ_l is always real. The following restriction on $\Phi^{(l)}$ is applied by assuming that experimentally obtained POVMs are always physical, i.e., $\hat{\Pi}_j$ is positive definite and $\sum_j \hat{\Pi}_j = \hat{I}$.

$$\begin{aligned}|\Phi_l| &= \left|\sum_{m+n=l}\frac{\theta_{mn}}{2\sqrt{m!n!}}\left((-1)^n - (-1)^m\right)\right|\\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{l}\frac{{\rm Im}\theta_{m(l-m)}}{2\sqrt{m!(l-m)!}}\left((-1)^m - (-1)^{(l-m)}\right)\\ &\le \sum_{m=1}^{l}\frac{1}{\sqrt{m!(l-m)!}}.\end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

See the next section for the proof of the inequality in the last line. Interestingly, the expectation values for the coherent state probes $|\pm i\gamma_k\rangle$ are also given as a function of $\Phi^{(j)}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle i\gamma_k|\hat{\Pi}_j|i\gamma_k\rangle - \langle-i\gamma_k|\hat{\Pi}_j|-i\gamma_k\rangle\\ &= e^{-|\gamma_k|^2}\sum_{m,n}\frac{(i\gamma_k)^{m+n}}{\sqrt{m!n!}}\left\{(-1)^m - (-1)^n\right\}\theta^{(j)}_{mn}\\ &= 2e^{-|\gamma_k|^2}\left(-\gamma_k\Phi^{(j)}_1 + \gamma_k^3\Phi^{(j)}_3 - \gamma_k^5\Phi^{(j)}_5 + \cdots\right)\end{aligned} \tag{A6}$$

Therefore, we can obtain the third and fourth terms in Eq. (A3) by first characterizing $\{\Phi^{(j)}_i\}$ from the experimental results with $|\pm i\gamma_k\rangle$ and then substituting them into Eq. (A4).

The experimentally measured count rates corresponding to Eq. (A6) is described as,

$$f^{(j)}_k = \frac{1}{2e^{-|\gamma_k|^2}}\left(\frac{f^{(j)}(i\gamma_k)}{\sum_l f^{(l)}(i\gamma_k)} - \frac{f^{(j)}(-i\gamma_k)}{\sum_l f^{(l)}(-i\gamma_k)}\right), \tag{A7}$$

where $f^{(j)}(\pm i\gamma)$ denotes the experimentally measured statistic for $\hat{\Pi}_j$ with the probe $|\pm i\gamma\rangle$. A set of $\Phi^{(j)}_l$ up to $l = 2K-1$ can be obtained from the probes $\{|i\gamma_k\rangle\}$ $(k = 1, \cdots, K)$ by solving the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned}&\min\{||f^{(j)} - \Gamma\Phi^{(j)}||_2\}\\ &\text{subject to}\sum_{m=1}^{l}\frac{1}{\sqrt{m!(l-m)!}} - |\Phi^{(j)}_l| \ge 0,\end{aligned} \tag{A8}$$

where $||v||_2 \equiv (\sum_i |v_i|^2)^{1/2}$ is vector norm, $f^{(j)} = [f_1^{(j)}, f_2^{(j)}, \cdots, f_K^{(j)}]^T$, $\Phi^{(j)} = [\Phi_1^{(j)}, \Phi_3^{(j)}, \cdots, \Phi_{2K-1}^{(j)}]^T$, and

$$\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} -\gamma_1 & \gamma_1^3 & \cdots & (-1)^K \gamma_1^{2K-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\gamma_K & \gamma_K^3 & \cdots & (-1)^K \gamma_K^{2K-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad \text{(A9)}$$

The expectation value of our measurement for the probe state $|\phi_{\rm Im}\rangle$ is indirectly investigated by the set of coherent states $\{|\pm\alpha\rangle, |\pm i\gamma_k\rangle\}$. In a similar manner, we can obtain the expectation value for a state $|\phi_{\rm Im}^-\rangle = (|\alpha\rangle - i|-\alpha\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ as well. We numerically simulated our reconstruction procedure and found that the probe states $\{|\pm i\gamma_1\rangle, |\pm i\gamma_2\rangle\}$, where the amplitudes are set to $\gamma = 0.20, 0.30$, in addition to $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ are sufficient to characterize the measurement in our experimental condition for the target SCS amplitude $\alpha = 0.50$. We apply the maximally likelihood method for the reconstruction of our measurement with the knowledge of the states $\{|\pm\alpha\rangle, |\phi_{\rm Im}^{\pm}\rangle\}$ and their measurement results obtained from above process.

Appendix B: Proof of the inequality in (A5)

Let $\hat{\Pi}_l \equiv \sum_{i,j}^d \theta_{ij} |i\rangle\langle j|$ be the lth element of a POVM in a d dimensional Hilbert space. To prove the inequality in (A5), it is sufficient to show that all entries in $\hat{\Pi}_l$ satisfy $|\theta_{ij}| < 1$.

We define the eigenvalues of $\hat{\Pi}_l$ as $\{\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_d\}$ with a general constraint $0 \le \lambda_i \le 1$ $(i = 1, \cdots, d)$ and

$$\hat{U} = [\bar{u}_1\, \bar{u}_2\, \cdots\, \bar{u}_d] \quad \text{(B1)}$$

as a unitary matrix in the same space, where $\bar{u}_i$ is an orthonormal vector in the d dimensional space,

$$\bar{u}_i = \begin{bmatrix} u_{i1} \\ \vdots \\ u_{id} \end{bmatrix}. \quad \text{(B2)}$$

Then $\hat{\Pi}$ is decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Pi}_l &= \hat{U}^\dagger \mathrm{diag}\,[\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_d]\, \hat{U} \\ &= [\bar{u}_1 \cdots \bar{u}_d]^\dagger\, [\lambda\bar{u}_1 \cdots \lambda\bar{u}_d] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \langle \bar{u}_1, \lambda\bar{u}_1\rangle & \cdots & \langle \bar{u}_1, \lambda\bar{u}_d\rangle \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle \bar{u}_d, \lambda\bar{u}_1\rangle & \cdots & \langle \bar{u}_d, \lambda\bar{u}_d\rangle \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad \text{(B3)}$$

where

$$\lambda\bar{u}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 u_{i1} \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_d u_{id} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{(B4)}$$

and $\langle \bar{u}, \bar{v}\rangle$ is the inner product of $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$. Due to the property of unitary matrix and λ_i we observe

$$\langle \bar{u}_i, \bar{u}_i\rangle = 1, \quad \langle \lambda\bar{u}_i, \lambda\bar{u}_i\rangle \le 1, \quad \text{(B5)}$$

and taking the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \bar{u}_i, \lambda\bar{u}_j\rangle| &\le \langle \bar{u}_i, \bar{u}_i\rangle^{1/2} \langle \lambda\bar{u}_j, \lambda\bar{u}_j\rangle^{1/2} \\ &\le 1, \end{aligned} \quad \text{(B6)}$$

which implies that the absolute value of each entry in the matrix of Eq. (B3) is always smaller than 1, i.e., $|\theta_{ij}| < 1$.

[1] A. Ourjoumtsev, R. Tualle-Brouri, J. Laurat, and P. Grangier, Science **312**, 83-86 (2006).
[2] J. S. N. Nielsen, B. M. Nielsen, C. Hettich, K. Molmer, and E. S. Polzik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 083604 (2006).
[3] K. Wakui, H. Takahashi, A. Furusawa, and M. Sasaki, Opt. Express **15**, 3568 (2007)
[4] A. Ourjoumtsev, H. Jeong, R. Tualle-Brouri, and P. Grangier, Nature **448**, 784 (2007)
[5] H. Takahashi, K. Wakui, S. Suzuki, M. Takeoka, K. Hayasaka, A. Furusawa, and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 233605 (2008).
[6] J. S. Neergaard-Nielsen, M. Takeuchi, K. Wakui, H. Takahashi, K. Hayasaka, M. Takeoka, and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 053602 (2010).
[7] T. Gerrits, S. Glancy, T. S. Clement, B. Calkins, A. E. Lita, A. J. Miller, A. L. Migdall, S. W. Nam, R. P. Mirin, and E. Knill, Phys. Rev. A. **82**, 031802 (2010).
[8] M. Yukawa, K. Miyata, T. Mizuta, H. Yonezawa, P. Marek, R. Filip, and A. Furusawa, Opt. Express **21**, 5529 (2013).
[9] J. Etesse, M. Bouillard, B. Kanseri, and R. Tualle-Brour, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 193602 (2015).
[10] J. S. Lundeen, A. Feito, H. Coldenstrodt-Ronge, K. L. Pregnell, C. Silberhorn, T. C. Ralph, and I. A. Walmsley, Nature Physic **5**, 27 (2009).
[11] G. Brida, L. Ciavarella, I. P. Degiovanni, M. Genovese, L. Lolli, M. G. Mingolla, F. Piacentini, M. Rajteri, E. Taralli, and M. G. A. Paris, New J. Phys. **14**, 085001 (2012).
[12] A. E. Lita, A. J. Miller, and S. W. Nam, Opt. Express **16**, 3032 (2008).
[13] C. M. Natarajan, M. G. Tanner, and R. H. Hadfield, Supercond. Sci. Technol. **25**, 063001 (2012).
[14] M. K. Akhlaghi, A. H. Majedi, and J. S. Lundeen, Opt. Express **19**, 21305 (2011).
[15] J. J. Renema, G. Frucci, Z. Zhou, F. Mattioli, A. Gaggero, R. Leoni, M. J. A. de Dood, A. Fiore, and M. P. van Exter, Opt. Express **20**, 2806 (2012).
[16] L. Zhang, H. B. Coldenstrodt-Ronge, A. Datta, G. Puentes, J. S. Lundeen, X. M. Jin, B. J. Smith, M. B. Plenio, and I. A. Walmsley, Nature Photon. **6**, 364 (2012).
[17] T. C. Ralph, A. Gilchrist, G. J. Milburn, W. J. Munro,

and S. Glancy Phys. Rev. A. **68**, 042319 (2003).
[18] S. W. Lee and H. Jeong, Phys. Rev. A. **87**, 022326 (2013).
[19] C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
[20] R. S. Kennedy, Research Laboratory of Electronics, MIT, Quarterly Progress Report No. 108, 1973 (unpublished), p. 219.
[21] S. Dolinar, Research Laboratory of Electronics, MIT, Quarterly Progress Report No. 111, 1973 (unpublished), p. 115.
[22] R. S. Bondurant, Opt. Lett. **18**, 1896 (1993).
[23] M. Takeoka, M. Sasaki, and N. Lütkenhaus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 040502 (2006).
[24] M. Takeoka and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 022320 (2008).
[25] S. Guha, J. L. Habif, and M. Takeoka, J. Mod. Opt. **58**, 257 (2011).
[26] S. Izumi, M. Takeoka, M. Fujiwara, N. Dalla Pozza, A. Assalini, K. Ema, and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 042328 (2012).
[27] S. Izumi, M. Takeoka, K. Ema, and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 042328 (2013).
[28] K. Tsujino, D. Fukuda, G. Fujii, S. Inoue, M. Fujiwara, M. Takeoka, and M. Sasaki, Opt. Express **18**, 8107 (2010).
[29] C. Wittmann, M. Takeoka, K. N. Cassemiro, M. Sasaki, G. Leuchs, and U. L. Andersen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 210501 (2008).
[30] K. Tsujino, D. Fukuda, G. Fujii, S. Inoue, M. Fujiwara, M. Takeoka, and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 250503 (2011).
[31] R. L. Cook, P. J. Martin, and J. M. Geremia, Nature **446**, 774 (2007).
[32] C. R. Müller, M. A. Usuga, C. Wittmann, M. Takeoka, C. Marquardt, U. L. Andersen, and G. Leuchs, New J. Phys. **14**, 083009 (2012).
[33] J. Chen, J. L. Habif, Z. Dutton, R. Lazarus, and S. Guha, Nature Photon. **6**, 374 (2012).
[34] F. E. Becerra, J. Fan, G. Baumgartner, J. Goldhar, J. T. Kosloski, and A. Migdall, Nature Photon. **7**, 147 (2013).
[35] F. E. Becerra, J. Fan, and A. Migdall, Nature Photon. **9**, 48 (2015).
[36] M. Bina, A. Allevi, M. Bondani, and S. Olivares, *arXiv:1408.0228* (2014).
[37] J. Fiurášek, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 024102 (2001).
[38] S. Miki, T. Yamashita, T. Hirotaka, and W. Zhen, Opt. Express. **21**, 10208 (2013).
[39] T. Yamashita, S. Miki, H. Terai, and Z. Wang, Opt. Express. **21**, 27177 (2013).
[40] M. Paris, J. Řeháček, *Quantum State Estimation* (Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 2004).